

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/735,649

Applicant(s)

FUKUDA ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Burleson

Art Unit

2626

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Michael Burleson.

(3) Nikolaus Schibli.

(2) Kimberly A. Williams.

(4) Philippe Signore.

Date of Interview: 10 November 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all independent claims.


Identification of prior art discussed: Kawai et al. (US 5715436) and Harney (US 5522080).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


KIMBERLY WILLIAMS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an
Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Schibli presented proposed amendments to independent claims that are believed to more define the present invention and to better distinguish between the cited references. For example, the memory switches pointed out by the examiner do not selectively connect the memories with the data operation unit. It is agreed by the examiner that the proposed amendment to the claims read over the art of record and a further search will be conducted upon filing of the amendment. Regarding claims 9 and 11, the claims have been amended to recite that the memories are local memories and is believed to distinguish over the prior art of record. The examiner will update the search upon filing of the amendment..